

T H I R T Y F I V E C E N T S

APRIL 1952

MONTHLY REVIEW

AN INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

SPECIAL 48-PAGE ISSUE

CANDIDATES AND ISSUES

THE EDITORS

**THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND
AMERICAN POLICY**

KUMAR GOSHAL

JAMAICA—THE WAY FORWARD

RICHARD HART

**THE GROWTH OF BEVANISM
UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS**

VOL. 3

12

EDITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEET

CONTENTS

VOLUME THREE NUMBER TWELVE APRIL, 1952

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Candidates and Issues	357
THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY by Kumar Goshal	364
UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS by A Student of Race Relations	377
THE GROWTH OF BEYANISM by A British Socialist	384
SOCIALISM AND THE "OVERPOPULATION BOGEY" by Paul M. Sweezy	390
JAMAICA: THE WAY FORWARD by Richard Hart	394
THE AMERICAN RESISTANCE: A COMMUNICATION by Scott Nearing	400
CONTENTS OF VOLUME III	403

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1952, by Monthly Review, Inc.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICE: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York. Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.

MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York. Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.

EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

This is a special 48-page issue. Kumar Goshal's article on the Indian elections is longer than MR articles usually are, but we thought its importance and the relative lack of reliable information on the subject in this country justified devoting the space to it. In addition, there were several items that have already been waiting one or two months to get in, and two important "Postscripts" arrived just as we were going to press. Rather than change the whole plan of the issue, we decided to add the necessary extra pages in spite of the relatively high additional cost. If you approve of this policy, and want to make it possible for us to follow it more frequently in the future, remember that what is really needed is more circulation to bring unit costs down.

I. F. Stone's *Hidden History of the Korean War* is now scheduled for publication on May 5th. On that date the special pre-publication price of \$3 will expire, and after that the book will sell at its regular price of

(continued on inside back cover)

CANDIDATES AND ISSUES

The 1952 presidential campaign has just got under way with the New Hampshire primary, and it seems appropriate to take a preliminary look at the candidates and the issues.

The first question that presents itself is this: Which candidacies are to be taken seriously and which are to be treated as maneuvers that really aim at something other than the presidency?

As of the middle of March, it looks as though the only serious candidates in the Republican Party are Taft and Eisenhower. Stassen and Warren, the other two who are actively campaigning, are probably angling for the vice-presidency or a cabinet post. MacArthur's game is obscure, but at this stage anyway he could hardly be called a candidate. In case of a Taft-Eisenhower deadlock—by no means an impossibility—a dark horse candidate may emerge into the spotlight, but not much of interest can be said about this at present.

In the Democratic Party, we have to take seriously the candidacies of Truman, Kefauver, and Stevenson. Russell of Georgia is obviously out to increase the Dixiecrats' bargaining power: he should not be treated as a bona fide candidate. Of course, when Truman definitely makes up his mind whether he wants to run again, the Democratic picture will change. If he decides not to run, he will be out and perhaps new hopefuls will enter the lists. If he decides to run, the Stevenson candidacy, and very likely the Kefauver candidacy too, will collapse. But this is only another way of saying that the situation is still unsettled and whatever we say about the candidates at this stage is of a preliminary nature.

It is very different in the case of the issues. Here the situation is clear and unlikely to change substantially in the months ahead. Moreover, what seem to be a large number of issues can, at least in a preliminary survey, be reduced to one: foreign policy. The reason for this is not that foreign affairs are inherently more important than domestic affairs, but that in the present state of the world, foreign policy determines *all* important domestic policies within rather narrow limits. It is impossible to pursue a foreign policy which requires preparing for and/or waging global war and at the same time follow

a domestic course of either fiscal retrenchment or social reform. Similarly, a foreign policy of this kind is certain to lead to the more or less rapid suppression of civil liberties as we have known them. Conversely, no program of economic reforms or defense of civil liberties or widening of civil rights can be taken seriously unless it is coupled with a foreign policy of political settlement and economic intercourse between nations and social systems.

It follows that presidential candidates must be judged first of all by their foreign policies. Only after we know where they stand in this field can we form any sort of reliable opinion of what they claim to stand for in other fields. The truth of this was well illustrated by what happened in 1948. Truman, already firmly committed to a policy of war preparations by the Truman Doctrine, campaigned on a platform of economic concessions to the lower-income groups, social reforms such as a federal health program and repeal of the Taft-Hartley Law, and widening of civil rights. In the event, his foreign policy remained unchanged and his domestic promises turned out to be valueless. Let us hope that this experience has taught the country a lesson it will not soon forget.

We now proceed to examine the five candidates picked out above, with particular attention to their foreign policies. Since the Democrats are easier to deal with, we begin with them.

Truman. There is no doubt where Truman stands and little chance that he will shift his ground. He and Acheson are the architects of the policy which may perhaps best be described as that of trying to win World War III without fighting it, a policy which could succeed only if the United States were able to achieve overwhelming military superiority as against the socialist world. Since no such superiority is in fact attainable, it follows that Truman's policy is a prescription for an unlimited arms race. Whatever promises he may make in the field of domestic policy are therefore worth exactly what his 1948 promises were worth—zero.

Kefauver. There is no essential difference between Kefauver's foreign policy and Truman's. So far as his published statements allow us to judge, he has no understanding of foreign affairs and is at least as inclined to warlike adventures as Truman and Acheson. He has devoted much energy to the empty and reactionary "Atlantic Union" utopia, which certainly speaks poorly for his judgment; and when the Iranian crisis was at its height last year he said that "it would mean war" if Iran fell into the Soviet orbit, not through any action of the Soviet Union's but because of internal Iranian "disintegration" (read "revolution"). (*New York Times*, May 29, 1951.) In foreign affairs, Kefauver is obviously half-baked—and dangerous.

Stevenson. Stevenson went into politics from a position in the State Department where he was a regular Democratic party-liner. He has remained just that. His foreign policy would probably be indistinguishable from the Truman-Acheson policy. Acheson might even remain as Secretary of State under Stevenson. It follows that Stevenson's much vaunted liberalism in domestic affairs is worth no more and no less than Truman's.

Eisenhower. Fundamentally, Eisenhower's foreign policy would also follow the lines chalked out by Truman and Acheson, but everything points to the conclusion that it would be even more belligerent and dangerous. For one thing, Eisenhower is a life-long military man and would doubtless increase the weight of the military in all government councils. His chief backers are men like Lodge (long an advocate of a super air force) and Dewey (political parent of John Foster Dulles and critic of the Truman administration's allegedly too-soft policy in the Far East). Eisenhower's own conception of the purposes of the American and NATO defense program is, if anything, even more explicit and frightening than Acheson's "Seven Points." In an interview given to the magazine *Paris Match* (a kind of French *Life* or *Look*) and published on October 27, 1951, Eisenhower said:

When the [defense] program has been fully carried out, there will come a delicate moment for peace: the risk of a showdown (*une explication*). But is it not better to accept the risk of a stormy showdown at that moment than the risk which we would be running if we remained inactive and Europe were left undefended and open to invasion? *We have only the choice between these two risks.* (Italics added.)

Acheson at least *talks* about eventual negotiations, while Eisenhower excludes the possibility entirely and thinks only in terms of a forced settlement. (The *Paris Match* interview, incidentally, also showed that Eisenhower's military thinking turns around the massive use of atomic weapons. "The new atomic arms," he said, "will probably offset (*rendront vaine*) all numerical superiority." Here is the General's answer to the otherwise insoluble problem of how to fight a war against the unquestionably superior land armies of the Soviet Union and its allies.)

There is no excuse for any illusions about Eisenhower. He is a man of war and, barring a miracle, will remain one. To exchange Truman for Eisenhower would be a step for the worse, not for the better.

Taft. Taft is the only real question mark among the five candidates we are examining. His reputation for isolationism dates

back to the days when isolationism meant letting the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis have its way. A careful examination of his record since the defeat of the Axis, however, shows that nothing but confusion can result from calling him an isolationist today. This is not the place for such an examination: it will be sufficient to call attention to a few of the highlights. When Truman committed American forces in Korea, Taft said that he thought the President was acting beyond his constitutional powers, but he did *not* take issue with the policy itself. In fact, he said that he was prepared to back a Congressional resolution endorsing Truman's action. In the so-called "great debate" over foreign policy just a little more than a year ago, Taft did not advocate retiring to the Western Hemisphere, as Hoover did. On the contrary, he accepted the obligations and implications of the North Atlantic Treaty; his differences with the Administration were of a different order. Whereas the Administration favored sending American troops to Europe, Taft argued that a general United States guarantee to all NATO members against aggression would be more effective. (In this connection, it should be remembered that the North Atlantic Treaty itself contains a clause which in effect guarantees signatories against internal revolution. Needless to say, this never outraged Taft's "isolationism.") It is true that the policy of a general guarantee against aggression differs in important respects from the Administration policy of building maximum armed force in Europe, but the one is no more isolationist than the other. The quality of Taft's "isolationism" was again put to the test in the MacArthur affair. Far from advocating a withdrawal from the Far East, Taft supported the MacArthur policy of spreading the war to China, and he has all along been Chiang Kai-shek's most powerful Congressional backer. True, he has often talked nonsense about "letting" Chiang's dilapidated armies invade the mainland, but nonsense is not the same as isolationism. In his recent campaigning, Taft has obviously been trying to use foreign policy as a vote-getting issue: he has been critical of Administration policy and has told audiences what he thought they wanted to hear with little or no regard for consistency. The *reductio ad absurdum* was reached in New Hampshire where Taft boldly placed himself on record as favoring a "sound foreign policy" with all specifications omitted.

On the basis of past performance, then, we should have to say that Taft belongs in general to the MacArthurite school in foreign policy, that he favors a more cautious policy in Europe and a more adventurous policy in Asia. But this is not the whole story. It is important that Taft is still widely *regarded* as an isolationist, that he has at one time or another talked all around many foreign

policy issues, that he has (probably deliberately) created confusion and doubt about where he really does stand. All this means that Taft is not committed to any course in foreign affairs. If elected President he would have a relatively free hand to shape his foreign policy without laying himself open to the charge of inconsistency and breaking promises. In this, he is alone among the candidates who now appear to have a chance of winning the election.

Why do we say that this is important? The answer lies in the differences in ruling-class opinion about foreign policy which we analyzed several months ago. ("Conflict in the Ruling Class?", February issue, pp. 293-301.) Quite apart from his own Big Business associations and his impeccably reactionary views on domestic issues, Taft is the obvious candidate of that group in the ruling class which sees the hopelessness of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy and would like somehow or other to halt the drift to war and economic disaster. If Taft could be elected, and if this group should continue to grow—a recent report by the United States Chamber of Commerce's Committee on Communism shows that it still is growing (see I. F. Stone's column in the *Compass* of March 11)—the possibility of a new departure in foreign policy could not be ruled out.

Meanwhile, needless to say, Taft is not betting all his chips on this outcome. He is actively wooing the MacArthurites and the McCarthyites, and it might well be they who would have the upper hand in a Taft Administration. In that case, Taft would in effect become a tool of the preventive warriors.

We conclude that the Taft candidacy, unlike the others, has opposite and indeed contradictory potentialities. It might lead to a slowing down of the Cold War and an attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union. Or it might lead directly and quickly to World War III. This accounts for much that would otherwise be inexplicable about the candidacy and for the ambivalent attitude of many people, including even some progressives, toward the man.

Against this background, let us consider very briefly the question of what progressives can do during the presidential campaign.

First, it seems quite clear to us that no progressive can conscientiously support any of the five candidates we have examined. On the basis of the foregoing analysis, the only one about whom there can be any doubt is Taft. But this doubt can be quickly resolved. Taft is just as likely—and on the basis of the evidence to date perhaps more likely—to move toward hot war as away from cold war. Moreover, it is perfectly certain that his course is not going to be influenced by progressives, for whom Taft has nothing but contempt;

rather it will be determined by the balance of forces within the ruling class. Under the circumstances, for progressives to support Taft would simply be an abdication of responsibility. Objectively—that is, no matter how good their intentions—they would be selling out to reaction.

What policy does make sense for progressives, then?

First, it seems to us that the movement to draft Justice Douglas for the Democratic nomination offers opportunities for useful and constructive work—provided, of course, that no grandiose illusions are built up about either the Democratic Party or Douglas himself. On the Supreme Court, Douglas has taken a strong pro-civil-liberties stand, and in his writings and speeches on foreign affairs he has shown that he recognizes the crucial importance of coming to terms with the revolution in Asia and other colonial and underdeveloped lands. This is not yet a foreign policy, and there are signs that Douglas is not immune to the redbaiting virus which is sooner or later fatal to all progressivism. Nevertheless, Douglas's position is much more hopeful than that of any other major political figure, and a vigorous campaign to nominate him should prove useful in stimulating political currents in opposition to MacArthurism abroad and McCarthyism at home.

Second, in some states, though doubtless not in all, the Progressive Party offers a valuable medium for political action. The PP candidates, Vincent Hallinan and Charlotta Bass, are fine people whom all progressives will be glad to support. By putting on a fighting campaign, for which they will of course need all the assistance they can get, they should be able to bring to many people all over the country a sense of the crucial issues and an understanding of how the Republican and Democratic Parties are failing to serve the real interests of the American people.

The draft-Douglas-movement and the Progressive Party are by no means ideal channels for political action, but they are the best available and they ought to be fully utilized. At the same time, however, a warning is necessary. A great mistake was made in 1948 when Henry Wallace was blown up to ridiculous proportions and all sorts of compromises and maneuvers were entered into for the purpose of catching votes. All this was done at the expense of the principles which should have guided the PP's policies, and it failed to achieve any useful results. On the contrary—and especially after Wallace's defection—the result was simply to confuse and disillusion people. Mistakes like this should certainly not be repeated this year.

Finally, a word to socialists: don't forget, in the heat of campaign activity, that your fundamental aim is to win people to

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

socialism. *The only genuinely strong progressive movement is a socialist movement, and all political education and activity should be guided by this principle.* In next month's MR, we shall attempt to clarify the outlook for American socialists and to show how they can relate the immediate issues and tasks of 1952 to the ultimate goal of a socialist America in a socialist world.

(March 17, 1952)

The Socialist tells you that you are men, with men's rights, and with men's capacities for all that is good and great—and you hoot him and call him a liar and a fool.

The Politician despises you, declares that all your sufferings are due to your own vices, that you are incapable of managing your own affairs, and that if you were entrusted with freedom and the use of the wealth you create you would degenerate into a lawless mob of drunken loafers, and you cheer him until you are hoarse.

The Politician tells you that his party is the people's party, and that he is the man to defend your interests, and in spite of all you know of his conduct in the past, you believe him.

The Socialist begs you to form a party of your own, and to do your work yourself, and you write him down a knave.

—Robert Blatchford, *Merrie England*, 1903

DOUBTFUL COMPLIMENTS DEPARTMENT

Something more should be said about the bad weather. It is all over the place, from Sarreguemines, where hailstones the size of pigeons' eggs just broke up a children's picnic, to the Jura, where tempests destroyed the vineyards. No scientist can get the average Frenchman to believe that these peculiar downpours—worse than the bad weather that upset the European climate during both world wars—are not un dérangement mondial caused by the atomic bombs. When the rain comes down for fourteen hours without a break, as it has done here recently, he mutters, "La pluie de Truman!"

—Letter from Paris in *The New Yorker*, July 28, 1951

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

BY KUMAR GOSHAL

Between October, 1951, and February, 1952, India held her first election based on universal adult suffrage. Let us examine these elections—the conditions in which they were held and their outcome—and see what light they shed on United States policy toward colonial and underdeveloped countries.

Of a population of about 310 million, 176 million were declared eligible to vote. Since 88 percent of them are illiterate, they had to vote by symbols assigned to such well-known political parties as the Congress Party, the Socialist Party, and the Communist Party, and to many other regional and local parties and independent candidates. Altogether there were nearly 50 political parties and an untold number of independents. The elections were held to fill 3373 seats in 22 state assemblies and three state electoral colleges, and 489 seats in the House of the People (the Indian Parliament). Each candidate had to deposit a \$200 bond—a very large sum for most parties—which was forfeited if the candidate failed to secure at least one-third of the number of votes cast for the winning candidate. No political party put up candidates for all the 3,862 seats; most parties contested seats in regions where they felt they had a strong following.

Prime Minister Nehru's Congress Party was the only party that ran candidates for most of the seats in the state assemblies and in the House of the People. Next in number were the 2000 candidates put up by the Socialist Party. The Communist Party put up only 500 candidates in a limited area, and about 200 more Communists were included among the candidates put up by a few regional left-coalition parties organized at the last minute.

The Congress Party, as the party in power that had recently made magnanimous concessions to businessmen and landlords, was able to command unlimited funds and to exert all kinds of pressure on the electorate, besides utilizing the glory of its past tradition and the personal prestige of Nehru. The Prime Minister himself traveled over 18,000 miles by an Indian Air Force plane and by other means, campaigning for Congress candidates in every state. The

Kumar Goshal, well-known writer and lecturer, is the author of The People of India and People in Colonies.

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

Socialists had wealthy backers and also the personal blessing of Nehru, who considered them less objectionable than the Communists. Some of the extreme rightist parties and individual candidates had the financial backing of wealthy landlords and businessmen.

The Communist Party, by contrast, was severely handicapped. It lacked sufficient funds. It had been declared illegal in some states and was only semi-legal in the others. Many of its leaders were in jail or underground with warrants out for their arrest on sight. In fact, several of its candidates remained in jail or underground throughout the elections. The Communist Party was also suffering from the effects of two severe internal crises in the years since World War II.

It was the general feeling, both in India and abroad, that under existing circumstances a 25 percent turnout at the polls would be more than satisfactory. The Congress Party was expected to poll at least 70 percent of the votes cast, with the Socialist Party running second, though far behind. No one was willing to prophesy any success for the Communist Party. "Competent observers here feel," *New York Herald Tribune* correspondent Margaret Parton reported on November 26, 1951, from New Delhi, "that the Communist Party will be lucky if it wins two seats out of the 500 it is contesting."

The election results were quite unexpected. More than 60 percent of the electorate went to the polls. Quite inevitably, the Congress Party secured a good majority of the seats in most state assemblies and in the House of the People. The Communist Party, however, emerged as the second strongest party in India. And the Socialists suffered a crushing defeat.

The Congress Party secured about 43 percent of the votes cast. Greater left-wing unity would have made the Congress percentage even lower. In the states of Bombay and West Bengal, although the Congress Party polled less than half the votes cast, it secured a majority of the seats in the respective assemblies because the Left was split into too many factions. Many Congress Party leaders, however, including state cabinet ministers, suffered ignominious defeat. "At least one big Communist victory can be put down as a resounding personal defeat for Mr. Nehru," *New York Times* correspondent Robert Trumbull reported from New Delhi, on February 3, 1952.

The Prime Minister went out of his way to campaign on the scene against A. K. Gopalan, noted Communist leader . . . recently paroled from a long term of "preventive" detention, as political jailings are called here. . . . When ballots were

MONTHLY REVIEW

counted yesterday Mr. Gopalan had beaten his Congress party rival by 87,029 votes.

Another Communist leader, Ravi Narayan Reddy, of Telengana in Hyderabad, outpolled all other individual candidates, including Nehru himself.

The Communists and their allies won about 50 percent of the seats they contested; where they lost, they often placed second or third, seldom losing their deposits. The Socialists, who scorned all offers of left unity, won less than ten percent of the seats they contested and often forfeited their bonds. Candidates like former Law Minister Dr. Ambedkar, who was educated at Columbia and campaigned on the basis of collaboration with the United States, were rejected by the voters. Candidates who stressed religious prejudices and extreme right-wing candidates made a very poor showing.

In the House of the People, Communists now have 27 seats; with their eleven allies and the support of some of the independents, they should have a solid bloc of about 45, which is easily the second largest group in Parliament. The Congress Party failed to secure an absolute majority in the states of Madras, Hyderabad, Travancore-Cochin, and PEPSU (Patiala and East Punjab States Union). In the first three, all in the South, the Communists and associated parties are attempting to form coalition governments; these three states and the state of West Bengal, where the Communists have strong representation, together account for nearly a third of India's population. In the small state of Tripura, on the eastern border of India, the Communists captured the largest number of seats.

Certain conclusions are quite obvious. A 60 percent turnout at the polls under primitive traveling conditions in much of the country is extraordinary; it would be considered remarkable even in the United States (fewer than 60 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls in the 1948 presidential election). This undoubtedly indicated the voters' genuine interest in the democratic process. Religious considerations evidently carried little weight, for those who appealed to religious sentiments fared poorly. The defeat of so many pro-American candidates demonstrated the unpopularity of American policy. And the failure of the Congress Party to secure even half of the votes cast displayed a widespread lack of confidence in the Nehru government.

Why did the majority of those voting refuse to endorse Congress Party candidates? As a gesture of protest, said many of the correspondents. But *Times* correspondent Robert Trumbull reported

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

from New Delhi that

Sober analysts here, including some inside the Congress Party, have pointed out that if the anti-Congress feeling were the only factor to be considered, then other opposition parties should have shown up better. It would seem rather that India's enormous electorate, which is 88 percent illiterate, made thoughtful choices at the polls, though not necessarily wise ones. (*New York Times*, February 10, 1952.)

It has also been said that the Communist Party received such impressive support because of a *general* trend to the Left. And Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, after spending four days in India, commented to Indian reporters: "Your elections did not show too great a change. There was an increase in the Communist vote, but that always comes where there is misery." (*New York Times*, March 2, 1952.) Granting the trend and the miserable condition of most of the voters, we still do not have an explanation of why so many voters chose the Communist Party in preference to several dozen other parties and innumerable independent candidates. In fact, a number of left-wing parties tried to cash in on this "misery" and "trend to the Left" by adopting platforms almost identical with that of the Communist Party. *Why* did so many voters pass them by?

The answer can be found by comparing the recent record of the Congress Party with what the Communist Party had to offer.

Before World War II, the Congress Party included both right- and left-wing elements. Its main financial backing came from Indian landlords and businessmen who thus hoped to control the political life and the economy of India if the Congress Party ever succeeded in freeing India from British rule. After the war, both the conservative leaders of the Congress Party and the British government realized, in the words of Justice Douglas, that "Asia is in revolution. Powerful forces are boiling up from the bottom . . . to make those who till the soil the recipients of the riches of the earth." (*Look*, August 14, 1951.) Conservative Congress Party leaders like the late Sardar Patel were aware that a successful Indian national revolution might not stop at political change alone but might push through social change as well, that not only the British rulers and profit-makers but the conservative Indian leaders and their Indian supporters also might be swept away. The British government, militarily and economically weakened by the war, was at the time facing far-flung military commitments as well as possible revolutions in several colonies besides India. A revolution in India, the British government felt, would be beyond its ability to control. Thus, both the conservative Congress Party leaders and the British government were ready to compromise.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Before coming to an understanding with the British government, Patel and other conservative leaders carried through a ruthless transformation of the Congress Party. Communist and other left-of-center members were thrown out of the party, and even the timid Socialists were maneuvered into leaving the organization. The rising of the Indian personnel of the Royal Navy in February, 1946, with tremendous popular support—evidence of the militant mood then prevailing in the country—was condemned by Patel and his colleagues who supported the British government's violent measures to suppress the rising.

As a part of the compromise agreement, the Indian conservative leaders accepted the uneconomic partition of the country into the predominantly Hindu Dominion of India and the predominantly Moslem Dominion of Pakistan. British economic interests were left untouched. The British government handed over political power to a hand-picked group of Indian leaders. Sardar Patel, boss of the Congress Party, like a veritable Pooh Bah, personally took over no less than five ministerial portfolios. Later, the new Indian government, with Nehru as Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, agreed to keep India within the British Commonwealth of Nations. All this was done without consulting public opinion, with the people remaining as bewildered bystanders.

This article cannot go into the details concerning all that the Congress government has done since it came to power in August, 1947. But a few of its activities require some consideration.

Before World War II, under the influence of its left wing which then included Nehru, the Congress Party had pledged to its followers that when India became free, a Constituent Assembly, elected on the basis of universal adult franchise, would frame a democratic Indian Constitution; that the land-tenure system would be drastically altered, returning the land to the peasants; that the government would promote a planned modernization of India's economy; and that foreign economic domination—the main cause of India's poverty and the reason for India's freedom struggle—would be eliminated.

Upon coming to power, the Congress Party set up a Constituent Assembly composed of those already in government positions, people who had been elected under British rule on the basis of a highly restricted franchise. The Assembly produced a 251-page Constitution remarkable for the wide powers it vested in the government, the guarantees it gave to property owners, and the cunningly conditional civil liberties it granted the people.

With regard to changing the land-tenure system, the Congress government has so far offered to buy over a billion dollars' worth

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

of land from landlords for eventual sale to individual peasants. The landlords, of course, have either refused to sell or have continued to bargain for higher prices, while the peasants have continued to starve to death.

When Congress came to power, it already possessed one plan for India's economic development, worked out by a planning commission under Nehru's leadership, and another drawn up by India's leading businessmen. Not satisfied with these, the government set up yet another planning commission, also under Nehru, which recently submitted a Five Year Plan. Drawn in two parts, the first part of this "plan" calls for the expenditure of about \$3 billion in an effort to restore pre-war standards of consumption by 1956, and the second part calls for the outlay of \$600 million—provided it can be secured through outside aid—to ensure a somewhat more rapid rate of development. The "plan," even if it is put into effect, will merely restore India to the economic level to which she had sunk after 150 years of British rule!

Besides allowing the continuance of foreign control over important sectors of the Indian economy, the government has made concessions to both foreign and domestic vested interests too numerous to detail. And the manner in which it has been willing to facilitate further foreign investments is illustrated in the government's contract with the Standard Vacuum Oil Company of America. According to this deal, Standard Vacuum will float an Indian subsidiary with \$35 million capital to build an oil refinery in Bombay. Twenty-five percent of this capital will be offered to Indian investors in the form of cumulative preference shares "carrying . . . no voting rights, while all the ordinary shares will be owned by Standard Vacuum." Indians, in other words, will have no voice in the control of the company. The government has given the company a guarantee against nationalization for at least 25 years as well as other extremely favorable terms. Even the ultra conservative *Hindustan Times* was obliged to characterize the concessions "as far too generous." But soon after this, the Congress government made the same deal with Burma-Shell and with Caltex.

To qualify for \$54 million in aid under the United States Mutual Security Act, Nehru has been persuaded to swallow the unpopular provision calling for cooperation with the United States in ways to maintain peace, a provision which both Burma and Indonesia have rejected. In addition, according to the liberal Indian weekly, *The Republic*, on January 12, 1952,

a considerable part of this fund will be absorbed through the "procurement of agreed goods, materials and contractor serv-

MONTHLY REVIEW

ices from sources outside India." . . . those U.S. citizens connected with this deal will have diplomatic status. Here is the provision: "The Government of India agrees that the Administration being an agency of the United States of America, wholly directed and controlled by the Government of the United States of America, will share fully in all the privileges and immunities, including immunity from suit in the courts of India, which are enjoyed by the Government in the United States of America."

Beyond this, it is stipulated that no part of this fund can be spent without the full consent of the American director.

This has been the way in which the Congress government has been functioning in India for the past five years. And in addition, the government has jailed political dissidents, including Communists, by the thousands without trial, coddled Big Business tax evaders and black-market profiteers, winked at widespread graft and corruption in government, and increased military expenditures to over 50 percent of the budget.

It can be seen that the Indian voters had more than enough reason to reject the Congress candidates. But why did so many of them choose Communist Party candidates in preference to Socialist and other candidates?

The minor left-wing parties lost in the elections because, in the past, they have devoted most of their time to interparty bickering and to violent attacks on the Communist Party, and they did nothing to convince the voters of their sincerity when they suddenly took over many of the planks of the Communist Party platform.

The Socialist Party, however, had some prestige, and some of its leaders enjoyed the personal friendship and esteem of Nehru. The weakness of the Socialists was that they had become too much of a carbon copy of the Attlee-Morrison group in the British Labor Party. After talking militantly on issues affecting labor and civil liberties, they had often collapsed when the government merely frowned upon them, calling off strikes and demonstrations even when they had overwhelming public support behind them. In the recent past, they had devoted much of their time to bitter attacks upon the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic, to such an extent that some top-ranking Socialist leaders like Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali found it impossible to stay within the party. Socialist candidates campaigned in terms of generalities, making it difficult to distinguish between them and the Congress Party candidates.

From many sources—including the writings of Nehru—Indians had for some time known of the remarkable achievements of Asians

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

in the Soviet Union. Recently, they had received convincing proof of the achievements of the People's Republic of China. Many of them had not unreasonably come to believe that the Communist Party, if it should come to power, would fulfill its program of confiscation of landlords' estates without compensation and free distribution of land to the peasants. They had learned that the Chinese, without any assistance from the western world but with the help of the Soviet Union, have been able to improve the economic situation in China in less than two years to the point where it was possible to export rice and other grain to starving India. Indians had realized that there can be no planned economic development without complete control over the resources of the country, that a party that plays at planning while actually facilitating further foreign control of the country's resources is untrustworthy.

But this is not all. Communist candidates benefited from the fact that the Communist Party had actually demonstrated its good faith within India itself. During 1948-49, in the Telengana section of the former princely state of Hyderabad, Communists and a dissident group of Congress members, under the leadership of the former, actually organized more than four million peasants, helped free them from the landlords, distributed the confiscated land to the tillers, set up a popular democratic government, and, while fighting both the prince's and the Indian government's troops, continued to promote education, improvement of agriculture, and practical democracy.

What convinced the Indian voters who supported Communist candidates of the reality of China's accomplishments was the testimony of representative non-Communist and even anti-Communist leaders who went to China and brought back glowing reports of what they saw. Late last year, for example, a well-known disciple of Gandhi, Pandit Sunderlal, headed a goodwill mission to China. Among the members of the mission were Dr. J. C. Kumarappa, President of Gandhi's All-India Village Industries Association and formerly Chairman of the Agrarian Reforms Committee of the Congress; Professor Habib, a Moslem, of Aligarh University; Professor Tripurari Chakravarty, of Calcutta University; Mrs. Hannah Sen, President of the All-India Women's Conference; K. A. Abbas, celebrated journalist, movie critic, and movie producer and director; and Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, head of the Delhi School of Economics and an economic adviser to the government, who was one of the two speakers at the India session of America's Town Meeting of the Air in 1949.

"We had taken care to see," Pandit Sunderlal said, "that none of our colleagues was a member of the Communist Party of India

MONTHLY REVIEW

so that we may not be charged of harboring any preconceived views in favor of the new regime in China." Dr. Rao, in fact, had made clear to the leader of the mission that he was strongly prejudiced against the doctrines of Communism. "And yet," Pandit Sunderlal said upon his return to India, "we have all come back inspired and enthused alike by what we saw in China. Dr. Rao now says that had he not seen with his own eyes he would never have believed the phenomenal achievements of the Chinese people after their revolution." (*India Today*, December, 1951.)

Concerning the same goodwill mission, *New York Times* correspondent Robert Trumbull reported from New Delhi on November 7, 1951, that

the Indian public has suddenly become extraordinarily conversant with life and thought in Red China, as reported by these professors, artists and others . . . Indian observers stressed that . . . the Peiping Government had no desire to fight the United States or any other power unless it felt that Chinese interests were imperiled . . . China was full of Soviet technicians, who did their jobs and silently departed . . . the Russians in China had not built up a "foreign colony" and . . . they lived in all respects as the Chinese did.

Despite mistakes which the Communist Party of India has made in the past, many Indians voted for the Communists because, as Nehru himself told the members of his own party in 1951: "The self-sacrificing spirit imbuing the Indian Communists and the hard, persistent work they put in are worth taking note of."

Indian voters shied away from pro-American candidates because they considered American policy aggressive and imperialistic. Quite apart from the nature of American participation in the Korean war, American support of the French in Vietnam seemed to the Indians as purely imperialistic. And Indians wondered why the United States—so prompt to take military action against alleged aggression in Korea—had failed to protest, much less send an expeditionary force, to Southwest Africa, when that territory was taken over by the Union of South Africa in defiance of the directive of the UN and the International Court of Justice. Indians do not forget that many of their kin are subject to brutal repression by the South African racists. The manner in which Standard Vacuum and other oil companies secured concessions from the Congress government also seemed like old-fashioned western imperialist maneuvers to exploit the raw material and cheap labor of an economically backward country.

American propaganda about the supposed horrors of Communist rule in China created resentment among Indians. In effect, it

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

seemed to them that Americans were telling Indians: "We have not been to China since the Communists forced Chiang to flee to Formosa; we have no diplomatic representation in China proper; what we know has been relayed to us second hand. Nevertheless you must believe what we say about conditions inside China." To Indians, it seemed that they were being called upon to regard their own respected non-Communist leaders like Pandit Sunderlal as liars! This, too, helped create anti-American sentiment in India.

The idea that the United States, the richest and the most powerful country in the world must have bases all over the world for its own protection from the Soviet Union and China strikes Indians, as it does all colonial and colored peoples, as completely unreasonable. For, they reason, it would be far more understandable for Indians, Malaysians, Indonesians, and Vietnamese to demand bases around Britain, France, the Netherlands, and the United States. Nothing in the past would indicate that the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic have aggressive designs against these countries of Southeast Asia; but Britain did conquer India, and is now fighting to keep the Malaysians in bondage; the Netherlands only recently was fighting with American assistance to reconquer Indonesia; and France even now is making a bloody attempt to hold on to Vietnam with American help.

Let us now enquire how American proposals for solving the economic ills of the underdeveloped and colonial countries of the world look in the light of events in India.

Overemphasis on agriculture, export of low-cost raw materials under the control of foreign investors (sometimes in partnership with home-grown capitalists), and the import of high-priced consumer goods—these are the hallmarks of a colonial economy. This is the prevailing condition in countries like India and the Philippines. The sinking of a few tube wells, as recommended by Ambassador Bowles (who, incidentally, travelled more than 8000 miles in India before and during the elections), and the building of a fertilizer plant or a few automobile assembly plants do not change the basic character of the economy. And the much publicized Point Four program, with all the frills it has acquired of late, offers nothing but an extension of this colonial-type economy.

In the report, entitled *Partners in Progress*, made to President Truman in March, 1951, by the International Development Advisory Board, of which Nelson Rockefeller was Chairman, the fields into which American investment in underdeveloped countries would be channeled were explicitly described: minerals, rubber, petroleum, fats and oils, some basic fibers. The report frankly stated that such investment was "for expanding the base of available raw materials."

MONTHLY REVIEW

Point Four as the miracle drug for the world's economic ills exists only in the imagination of those who would change the world without changing themselves, who would eat their cake and have it too. At almost every session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Western delegates have gently but firmly urged the Asians to avoid the toil and trouble of building modern industries, to develop agriculture and the production of raw materials, and to let the western countries supply them with consumer goods! But even conservative Asian economists like Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao are skeptical of the value of Point Four aid to their countries.

American capital, often called "risk" or "venture" capital, has evidently grown old and needs crutches for support. In its June, 1950, report on "Financing Economic Development," the International Chamber of Commerce stated: "Whatever may have been the case in the past, today it is the exporter of capital who needs protection." Therefore, capital importing countries must create a "favorable climate" for investment from abroad. And the "favorable climate" turns out to be nothing but the kind of concessions the Indian government has been making to the American and British oil companies.

It has now become quite respectable to champion "land reform." Conservatives and radicals alike advocate a change in the feudal land-tenure system in economically backward countries. Nelson Rockefeller's report emphasized that "it is imperative that land reform should be encouraged" in the regions where American capital would be invested. But how is it to be done?

The general idea seems to be that local governments should buy out the landlords and sell the land to the peasants. But, as in India, the landlords obstinately refuse to cooperate. Let us imagine, however, that the Indian government offers the landlords compensation fabulous enough for them to part with their land. Where is this money to come from? And where will the starving peasant get the money to make even a down payment? The backs of most of the peasants are already bent under a staggering load of debt. The Indian government does not seem to be worrying about this at the moment, but the peasant is. Having suffered generations of exploitation to enrich the landlords, the peasant now feels thoroughly justified in taking the land without compensation.

American policy towards the Far East and the colonial and economically backward countries of the world has failed at least partly because it has obstinately avoided the real issues involved. American solutions for the problems of these countries fall on deaf

THE INDIAN ELECTIONS AND AMERICAN POLICY

ears because American policy-makers lack understanding of what these problems are.

The issues in the poverty-stricken parts of the world today are of two kinds: those concerned with political, social, and economic emancipation from foreign and domestic exploitation; and those concerned with rapid economic advancement of hundreds of millions of people. The problems are those of finding the most effective ways and means to remove the obstacles barring the path to emancipation and development. It is the very nature of these obstacles that precipitates violence, that demands a revolutionary solution.

The obstacles are not so much the illiteracy and the religious beliefs of these people as the powerful feudal landlords and foreign vested interests who have for too long exploited them mercilessly. It is to remove these deep-rooted obstacles that, as Justice Douglas had the courage and vision to write, "Asia is in revolution. . . . No number of atomic bombs—no amount of firepower—no number of troops can turn the tide of that revolution." (*Look*, August 14, 1951.)

That is the plain truth, and no force on earth can change it. Speed is now essential. To suggest patience to these long-suffering people is to add insult to injury. To tell them that patience will be rewarded by the voluntary abdication of power by the oppressors is to practice a deception which in the end deceives no one but those who profess it.

The theory that the colonial and other exploited peoples of the world would prefer to be patient rather than work with Communists is belied by the results of the Indian elections. The impressive vote the Indian Communist Party piled up in the elections demonstrated that there are people who, without the slightest external pressure and despite strong internal pressure from a reactionary government, vote for the Communist Party of their own free will because its program appeals to them and meets their needs.

A sound American policy towards the Far East and the colonial and economically backward countries must first of all be based upon an unequivocal acceptance of *the right of all peoples to be free*. The United States will have to realize, as the sober Quaker analysts realized, that the acceptance of communism and Communist leadership is not the result of a diabolical conspiracy by a handful of sinister people. "The present advances of Communist movements in Asia," the *Quaker Proposals for Peace* states, "would indicate that among peoples who have been subjected, in one form or another, to western imperialism, the Communist pattern for political and industrial revolution, with its emphasis on equality of economic op-

MONTHLY REVIEW

portunity regardless of racial or national differences, is likely to have considerable appeal."

Fruitful and friendly relationships with economically backward countries can be established by the United States—but only by exchanging goods mutually needed, by converting from a war to a peace economy, by producing more capital goods than coca cola for export, and by planning American production to meet the demand for the kind of goods required to fulfill the plans of countries in the process of developing an industrial economy and a rapidly rising standard of living.

We did not realize that in some regions of Asia it is the Communist party that has identified itself with the so-called reform program, the other parties being mere instruments for keeping a ruling class in power. We did not realize that the choice between democracy and communism is not, in the eyes of millions of illiterates, the critical choice it is for us.

—Justice William O. Douglas, *New York Times*, January 13, 1952

Let us look at the Far East. The military movements there are revolutionary. They are designed to throw the white man out and recover the region for its inhabitants. They aim at the drastic revision of the social, economic, and political structure. We can see this clearly if we imagine a world without Communism and even without Russia and ask ourselves what difference there would be between the Far East as it is today and as it would be then. Perhaps the slogans would be somewhat different; the result would be the same.

—Robert M. Hutchins, in the *Compass*,
March 25, 1951

Social change occurs precisely because men have universally the same basic needs, and when they find they cannot satisfy those needs within a given social system, they change to another. In the course of these changes men also transform themselves.

—Barrows Dunham, *Man Against Myth*

UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS

BY A STUDENT OF RACE RELATIONS

In the long history of exploitation of colonial peoples by modern imperialist nations an effective technique has been to select certain ambitious members of the exploited group itself to act as a foil to and frustrater of the restive leadership of the oppressed. In the West Indies, for example, the British have made extensive use of light-complexioned Negroes for this purpose. These have been made to feel that their light color itself is a thing of superior value which has naturally merited them their superior governmental positions and titles of honor. Thus the leadership of the people is corrupted; it even becomes sensitively hostile to signs of unrest among the masses. Out of such a situation Marcus Garvey arose in the twenties to become one of the fiercest antagonists to the pretensions of the mulattoes.

The result is that the colored people remain divided and, therefore, at the disposal of the imperialists. In the days of slavery in the United States, the Southern oligarchy was always able to point to the joyous laughter of the trusted slaves and to their role as informers against their fellow bondsmen as an answer to the attacks of the abolitionists. The slaves themselves, the master class would argue, are happy and contented; compared to their former condition in Africa they should be considered as having made great progress. If there is occasional unrest, it must be attributed to "outside interference" or to "criminal" ringleaders among them.

During Reconstruction, the oligarchy, now commercially aligned with the ruling class in the North, discovered Negro spokesmen to plead its cause before a critical world. Among them, Booker T. Washington is outstanding. As is well known, his Atlanta address embodies the classic racial position of the ruling class: Negroes have made greater progress than any other race in a comparable period of time; Negroes are contented with their position as auxiliaries to the white man's economic purposes; Negroes resent "outside interference"; this is the best country for Negroes; Negroes do not now have "equality," but the best way to get it is to show themselves worthy of it by being docile and zealous workers. As a partial counteraction to these Negro friends of the oligarchy, the NAACP struggled to its feet in 1910 and began its campaign for full citizenship rights for

The author is a distinguished university teacher of social science.

MONTHLY REVIEW

Negroes. To be sure, this goal is still largely unrealized forty years later.

A new situation has now arisen in which the United States' treatment of Negroes is being presented to the peoples of the world much as the abolitionists of the North publicized the inhumanity of the slavemasters. This is another and wider stage in the development of human rights and, consequently, of democracy in the world. The sensitive forum for the attack on the racial practices of the ruling class in the United States has become the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The peoples of the world are coming to understand that race prejudice and antagonism are the ideological, the non-material, aspects of capitalist exploitation of colored peoples. They are the social device which operates to justify and facilitate the economic purposes and methods of the exploiter of colored peoples under capitalism. Socialism has no need for it. Therefore, as individuals or countries become socialist, they tend to slough off their race prejudices together with the other sacred ideologies of capitalism. To the extent that race prejudice subsides in a dominant capitalist nation, to that extent also capitalism is weakened. In major efforts at resuscitating capitalism, such as fascism, racial antagonism is necessarily excited.

In the present period, therefore, the reactionary capitalist leadership in the United States finds itself in a dilemma. The great mass of Asian peoples who have borne and are still bearing the imperialist yoke have also been subjected to racial prejudice and discrimination by their white exploiters. They feel, and correctly, that race prejudice and discrimination are inconsistent with democracy and that the treatment of Negroes in the United States vitiates this country's attempt to represent itself to the world as the champion of democracy.

Since racial antagonism has indispensable uses to American capitalists, it would be suicidal for them to attempt seriously to abolish it by law and public coercion. The alternative is to present to the world certain articulate American Negroes as living proof that Negroes are contented with life in the United States.

The first Negro chosen for this purpose was Mrs. Edith Sampson, whose Town Meeting address in Delhi, India, on September 13, 1949, can be regarded as her Atlanta address. In this propaganda tour around the world, Mrs. Sampson was selected for India where the group had to face probably its most unsympathetic audience. She went to the attack at the very opening of her speech:

Do Negroes have equal rights in America? My answer is no, we do not have equal rights in all parts of the United States. But let's remember that 85 years ago Negroes were slaves and were 100 percent illiterate. And the record shows that the

UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS

Negro has advanced further in this period than any similar group in the entire world.

No Negro, of course, could make such a statement to an unselected Negro audience without being hauled off the stage. It must be assumed that Mrs. Sampson knew that Negroes were not 100 percent illiterate 85 years ago; if not "in all parts," some American Negro would have asked her in *which* parts of the United States do Negroes have equal rights. The old sop that Negroes have made more rapid progress than any other people is clear nonsense. Her whole talk was a shabby effort to reject all criticism of racial conditions in the United States. During the question period a man asked her whether it was "not because of segregation that Ralph Bunche refused an important position in Washington?" She answered:

That is my understanding, from what I read in the paper, as well as from one of Dr. Bunche's personal friends, Mr. Walter White; but he had three reasons for refusing the position. The reason you have just stated was the last of the three reasons, and not the first and immediate reason. His basic reason for having refused the position was that his position with the United Nations was a very important job which he wished to finish. Moreover, he had a family and children to rear and, because of the superior salary with the UN, he felt it quite necessary to pick the job which gave him the greatest amount of returns.

In this way, the leading question of the East Indian which had to do with one of the most pressing problems among Negroes in the United States, segregation, was artfully circumvented. Mrs. Sampson's impatience and probably her confusion seem to have reached a climax when she was asked: "Don't you think Communism only proves people's democracy, and democracy, as practiced today, is just an apology for it because of its adoption of capitalism?" The question was not very clear, to be sure, but it obviously concerned the relation between capitalism and democracy, and it could easily have been interpreted and politely answered. Instead, Mrs. Sampson said: "Well, my dear young man, I think you want to put a question, but it isn't sufficiently intelligent for me to understand it. I'm sorry."

This Indian performance immediately brought Mrs. Sampson to the favorable attention of the propaganda machine of the State Department, with the final result that President Truman appointed her as an alternate in the United States delegation to the 1950 meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. Concerning this, the *New York Times* (August 20, 1950) said editorially:

Every time a Negro breaks ground in this fashion, the way is made a little easier for those who follow. Even more

MONTHLY REVIEW

significant is the effect an appointment such as this may be expected to have on world—particularly Asiatic—opinion. Here is one more living denial to the canard spread by Moscow and believed by many non-Communists elsewhere that it is American policy to keep the Negroes as a helot class. Mrs. Sampson is in a good position to help tell the truth. She has visited India and, according to reports, has been an effective exponent of American democracy at its best.

And the *Times* quoted her as saying:

I would be glad to refute such propaganda. There are pitfalls for our race in this country, of course, but they are not as bad as the Kremlin would like to picture them.

On the appointment, *Time* magazine (August 28, 1950) commented:

On the tour of the Orient last year Edith Sampson showed that she was adept at the kind of debate which breaks out in the UN. . . . She conceded that there were shortcomings, but added: "I would rather be a Negro in America than a citizen in any other land."

Here, then, is a Negro, selected to speak about Negro life in the United States, who is not concerned about the common cause of Negroes but whose purpose is rather to oppose any one in the UN who speaks in the interest of that common cause. On the whole, the Negro newspapers saw the Negro people as betrayed by the appointment. P. L. Prattis, executive editor of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, wrote (September 2, 1950):

Last year Mrs. Sampson spoke in New Delhi on the Town Hall tour. I did not hear the speech, unfortunately. But my friends who did hear her were utterly disgusted by her answer to the young Indian interrogator. I am Mrs. Sampson's friend. . . .

I am telling her what many friends would not tell her. . . . These friends thought she had missed a chance to speak for her race and had apologized for the acts of white Americans against Negro Americans. . . . If Mrs. Sampson should use the stage of the General Assembly as a platform for double-talk in which the injustices her people suffer here will be glossed over, she will rue the day the appointment came to her. . . . The whites have repudiated Paul Robeson but the masses of Negroes, brooding in their hearts, have not.

This urge among Negroes to punish their so-called leaders who are clearly "selling them out" is genuine, although American Negroes do not have the power or opportunity to do this. Indeed, the status and glamour which the ruling class is able to confer upon these

UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS

persons frequently overawe their critics. To Negroes whose fondest ambition has been to gain recognition and standing within the framework of the *status quo*, the sight of one of their members fraternizing with minions of the ruling class is sometimes so overwhelming that almost any means may appear to justify the end.

In but a few months, Prattis himself (*Courier*, December 23, 1950) seems to have suffered such a captivity. The following statement indicates classically one significant social force which serves to complicate the Negro problem:

Friday afternoon, December 1, I sat in the vast chamber of the General Assembly of the United Nations at Flushing Meadows. Here were gathered the representatives of sixty nations, the power and pomp of the world. . . . Here were the great and the near-great. Here were the newspaper headliners, the population of a political *haut monde* which most of us only read about. Here were the men and women the hems of whose garments are precious and touchless to the teeming millions. . . .

As I sat and watched and listened I knew this was the biggest stage in the world. . . . A vote had been taken, counted. . . . After the president had announced the vote, he paused, then continued: "*Mrs. Edith Sampson, United States Delegate, desires to explain the reason for her government's failure to vote.*"

Brothers and sisters, can you get the feel of this announcement in the parliament of the world? Can you sense the prickling thrill which quickly possessed me? Can you see this brown woman, belonging to you and me, rise from her seat in the center of the chamber and stride with steady gait to the spotlighted rostrum and take her place before the lectern?

This, of course, shows the Negro in an almost pitiful light. What Mrs. Sampson had to say was of little moment. To her recent critic, the acme of her achievement was simply being in the spotlight: the mere symbolism of free participation in the culture disarmed and prostrated him.

Mrs. Sampson, for her part, has continued to deflate the Negroes' cause on every strategic occasion. Although, when she returned to the United States, the entire tour group was refused hotel accommodations in Washington, D. C. because she was included among them, she has severely censured Josephine Baker for making an issue about her Stork Club discrimination. She has been one of the leading hecklers of members of the Russian delegation in the UN.

We have discussed Mrs. Sampson at length as a characterization of the situation. The 1951 Negro alternate, Dr. Channing Tobias, falls exactly into pattern. Recently, when the United States criticized the state of human rights in the Soviet Union, Foreign Minister

MONTHLY REVIEW

Andrei Vishinsky answered by citing Sheriff Willis McCall's shooting of his Negro prisoners, Samuel Shepherd and Walter Irvin, in Florida, as an example of human rights in the United States. This was the cue for the Negro delegate to go into action. The *New York Times* (November 11, 1951) reported:

Dr. Channing Tobias . . . told reporters that American Negroes were making progress toward equality despite occasional lynchings, discriminations, and segregation. "We prefer to take our chance in a democracy." He said such incidents occurred in defiance of law and not through law. "If there had been such an incident in Mr. Vishinsky's country, there would have been no free news channel through which the incident could be made public."

To this *The Nation* (November 24, 1951) replied: "Unfortunately, the facts of the Florida case refute this statement: it was the 'law' that shot down the two Negroes."

The Negro press has been publishing letters criticizing the Negro delegates. One of these, by a William Hutchinson (*Courier*, January 12, 1952), complained about a void in Negro leadership: "Instead we hear much of Dr. Channing Tobias being called upon to 'flay' Mr. Vishinsky . . . not so much because he was qualified to, but because he is now United States exhibit No. 1 in the UN."

A more concerted effort against the Negro delegates is the attempt by the Civil Rights Congress to place before the UN General Assembly a document "listing crimes committed against the Negro people" and entitled *We Charge Genocide*. It has been argued that on the basis of an account of the actual destruction of Negro lives and property the charge of genocide appears remote. And yet, logically, the life of every American Negro is at stake if he attempts to claim his citizenship rights. Suppose that Negroes should try to act as though they really possessed the equal democratic rights which the State Department tells the world exist in the United States. Is it not clear that they would be rebuffed by force and that if they persisted they would be slaughtered? Are not the very armed forces of the Federal government ultimately available in support of such violence against Negroes?

Mrs. Sampson and Dr. Tobias have been doing their best to sell Jim Crow America to the world, and they are entitled to the thanks of the State Department and the ruling class in general. What they deserve from the embattled colored masses throughout the world is quite something else again.

UNCLE TOM IN STRIPED PANTS

RIGHTS OF NEGROES CITED

Tobias Answers Taunt by Soviet Bloc Delegate in U.N.

Paris, Feb. 2—Dr. Channing Tobias told a Soviet bloc speaker who taunted him today with repressions against Negroes in the South that all citizens of the United States had the right to fight injustice.

The United States delegate had been told by S. P. Demtchenko of the Ukraine during debate in the United Nations Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee that, since Dr. Tobias was a Negro, he would be subject to Jim Crow in the United States. "If you had wanted to marry a white girl, you would have been asked the percentage of your Negro blood," the Ukrainian said.

Dr. Tobias replied that there were "bad laws" in the United States and violations of "good ones." But he said that any Negro in the United States had the right to complain to the highest officer in his state.

—New York Times, February 3, 1952.

American conceptions of freedom seem to an ever increasing number of Europeans hardly more than a luxury product, a verbalization of their comfortable vested position in the present capitalist structure. How many are capable of realizing that to Czech National Socialists and Social Democrats, as well as to the Communists, freedom is not merely the chance for anybody to do what he will with his own property? Freedom can be gained and protected only by groups functioning together, with their sense of social responsibility as highly developed as their sense of individual privilege. That is what I understand by the definition of freedom as the recognition of necessity.

—F. O. Matthiessen, *From the Heart of Europe*, 1948

THE GROWTH OF BEVANISM

BY A BRITISH SOCIALIST

The Labor Party has been in opposition for five months. In that short time, there have been two striking changes in the political situation. First, the trend to the Tories—which had been going on steadily since early 1947—has been halted and reversed. Second, what is loosely described as “Bevanism” has been growing steadily, not only in the local parties but also in the much less flexible Parliamentary party. Both changes spring from the same root causes—the continuing drift to war and the economic crisis caused by rearmament.

Few parties have enjoyed such a brief honeymoon as the Tories. Six years of demagogic propaganda finally gave them a majority at Westminster; it would have been destroyed if an election had been held after they had been in office six weeks. They have already confessed their inability to carry out their lavish promises of more food, more houses, and greater economic freedom. They have imposed charges for the National Health Service, cut public education, raised interest rates on money loaned to local authorities, and failed to do anything about the rising cost of living. Finally, they have combined this political somersault with an administrative incompetence which could not be concealed, even when Parliament was sent on a two-month Christmas recess and Ministers were free from the daily scrutiny of the House of Commons. It is small wonder that the opinion polls now credit Labor with a substantial lead.

There is nothing, of course, at which the Labor Party is more adept than making political capital by blackguarding the Tories. Indeed, as the Labor leadership ran out of a program of its own, it was left with very little on which to fight the last two elections save popular mistrust of the Tory party. Labor speakers are now supplied with fresh ammunition to carry on that battle. So far, so good. The Guilty Men of the thirties, as the radical *Reynolds News* puts it in a pamphlet summarizing the broken Tory pledges, are being proved “guilty again.” And among industrial workers feeling against Churchill’s government is rising so rapidly that the Labor leadership has been making public appeals to miners, railwaymen, and other trade unionists to confine their

The author is MR's regular correspondent in London. His most recent article was “The Labor Party's Next Task” in the December 1951 issue.

opposition to regular political channels, rather than resort to "un-constitutional" strikes and go-slow movements. It was only after much discussion, for instance, that the official leaders of the South Wales miners agreed to honor their agreement to work overtime and Saturday shifts *until it runs out at the end of April*, while many collieries have had to abandon Saturday working because so few miners reported for the shift.

Yet, despite the remarkable recovery that Labor has made in opposition, it remains a negative recovery. Labor might well win an election now, but it would win on a protest vote *against* the Tories and not on any positive program of its own. As things stand, there is no more an agreed party policy than there was last October. Unless, in the next few months, Labor can work out a policy which offers a genuine socialist alternative to Tory rule, there would be little point in winning an election: the right-wing leadership would once again be faced with the problems which it could not solve when it was in office before.

Defeat, in short, has at last brought Labor to the crossroads. The conditions under which the party ruled from 1945 to 1951 have disappeared. Inflation is rapidly wiping out the real benefits of the Welfare State and the post-war wage advances. The rearmament program is destroying the precarious balance of the "mixed economy," wrecking Britain's overseas trade, and enforcing an increased economic and political dependence upon the United States. Any new Labor policy, therefore, must provide some solution to all these problems. The difficulty is that each of them has arisen, in large measure, from the policies pursued by the past Labor governments, and it is both politically and psychologically difficult for former ministers to free themselves from the assumptions on which those policies were based. When they attempt to do so, as the recent debate on foreign policy revealed, they are caught in a trap. The Left of the party could happily censure Churchill for conditionally committing Britain to an extended war in the Far East: it neither supported nor even knew of similar undertakings given by Attlee and Morrison, whatever suspicions it may have had. But it was easy for Churchill to call Morrison's bluff by revealing that the Labor government had in fact made much the same agreement with Washington. Similarly, the Labor leadership cannot easily attack the level and pace of rearmament, for the present target was set up by Attlee's administration; they are embarrassed when they have to vote against cash payments for medical treatment, for it was Labor's proposal to do the same thing that led to Aneurin Bevan's resignation; and they can slide into opposing German rearmament only because the Labor government's agreement to this

in principle was qualified by four conditions which are unlikely to be fulfilled.

In this situation, it is inevitable that the initiative inside the party should pass to the "Bevanites" who represent the only relatively coherent group which is capable of formulating an alternative policy. The term itself is unfortunate, since strictly it means only the twenty or thirty MPs who form a kind of informal caucus around the three ministers who resigned—Bevan, Wilson, and Freeman. Actually the "Bevanites" include today a working coalition of all the groups on the Left who, for tactical purposes, are prepared to march into the party fight under Bevan's leadership, though they may differ from Bevan on specific issues.

A year ago, "Bevanism" was not much more than a general sense of uneasiness about the course of Labor's policy. It was only after the resignations that certain points of principle began to emerge. Even now, "Bevanism" has many nuances and ambiguities. But it is closer to offering a positive policy than any other element or group in the party, and it may be helpful to set down the points on which there is fairly general agreement among the "Bevanites."

1. Opposition to any form of bi-partisan policy.
2. No extension of the war in the Far East; admission of the Peking Government to the UN; revision of the Japanese Peace Treaty.
3. No rearmament of Germany.
4. An extension of East-West trade.
5. Resistance to any attacks on the people's living standards and to cuts in the social services.
6. A drastic reduction in the present armament program.
7. No further dependence upon United States economic aid.

Here, at least, are the beginnings of a possible socialist policy, for on many of these points it would today be possible to secure unanimity in most constituency Labor parties and a wide measure of agreement even among MPs who would be horrified if they were called "Bevanites."

The most immediate and important point is the demand for a reduction in the arms program. Nye Bevan declared from the beginning that the Labor Government's \$13.6 billion program was unnecessary, ruinous, and impossible. The bitter dispute last summer ranged around this assertion. Today, that program has in fact been abandoned even by the Tories, and only the diehard Right of the Labor Party still clings to it. If it were to be carried out, something like \$6 billions would have to be voted this year: the estimates in fact provide only for \$4.2 billions. Even this level, how-

ever, is too high for the British economy. It is causing serious distortion, diverting production from much needed exports, imposing a heavy burden of taxation, worsening Britain's balance of payments crisis, and liquidating the Welfare State. Given Britain's economic position, it can be carried out only by a "civil" cut totalling \$2.7 billions: this cut will have to fall on private consumption and investment, Government civil expenditure, and stockpiling. (Incidentally, the decision to cut stockpiling by \$1.2 billions provides an interesting commentary on official "expectations" of Soviet aggression in the near future.) The "Bevanite" view is that a drastic fall in living and social standards, and an appalling economic crisis, can be avoided only by cutting arms spending back to a maximum of \$2.8 billions a year. If this were done, it would be possible to meet the crisis in Britain's balance of payments without undue hardship. It would not be necessary to cut imports by \$1.5 billions a year: the increased exports needed to close the gap could be found if resources were not being consumed by the arms drive.

This is the only way out of the economic crisis for Britain. Once the excessive arms program is accepted, then the general economic crisis follows. Solvency, and independence of the United States, can be achieved only by cutting arms expenditure. That, of course, would eventually mean a change in Britain's foreign policy.

If the Left in the Labor party moves on, as it has already moved in the past year, it can work out a socialist solution to Britain's difficulties. Whether it can get that policy accepted by the party as a whole depends upon the course of the inner party struggle, and on the degree of assistance it is given by events. So far, history seems to be on Nye Bevan's side. But is time also on his side?

Postscript: After this article was written, the inner party conflict came to a more rapid crisis than had been expected. For the Bevanites, the defense program raised a fundamental issue of principle. It was, they argued, impossible to approve the program and oppose the budget burdens and economies that the program makes necessary. Yet the Labor leadership felt obliged to vote for the Tory defense proposals; they were, after all, only a slightly scaled-down version of the plans prepared when Labor was in office. But, equally, the ex-ministers felt it politically necessary to condemn the Tory budget. The Bevanites, on the other hand, were in a stronger position, both logically and politically. They refused to support a rearmament program which to them seemed economically ruinous, technically unattainable, and militarily unnecessary. And they wished to keep

MONTHLY REVIEW

their hands free to attack the "anti-working-class" budget expected from the Tories.

In the event, some 57 Labor MPs refused to follow the leadership into the division lobby: on the Labor motion which had been approved by a majority vote in a private party caucus, they abstained; on the substantive Tory motion, they opposed, while the Labor Party officially abstained. In a purely formal sense, the "rebels" had not violated the party rules. But they had, in effect, made a public demonstration against the leadership.

Attlee, Morrison, and Gaitskell at once decided to make this issue a trial of strength, and for a few days there was talk of expelling, or at least sharply disciplining, the Bevanite rump. The steering committee of the party caucus in fact voted by 8 to 2 for such measures. This crisis assumed such dimensions that it stole the headlines for five days before the budget. On the morning of March 11th, the Parliamentary Labor Party met in judgment. The result, for the Bevanites, was more than a defeat for the right wing; it was a tactical victory for the Left. Despite urgent demands for severe action by Attlee, as party leader, the Labor MPs voted—the figures are said to be 162 to 70—a motion which merely affirmed the need for party unity and suggested an enquiry into the need for standing orders which would ensure compliance with majority decisions. The leadership, faced with a majority against it, decided that discretion was the better part of rancour, and withdrew its own motion.

While the crisis has thus been solved less dramatically than the anti-Bevanites—both Labor and Tory—had hoped, and while this solution only shelves the fundamental dispute inside the party, it nevertheless represents a step forward for the Left. For the first time, in the series of inner party revolts since 1945, the "rebels" have proved cohesive enough to stand together in face of pressure from the leadership, and strong enough to refuse to give way. When the crisis reached its climax, moreover, more than a hundred other MPs were prepared to join with the 57 "rebels" against the leadership's demand for disciplinary action. Not all of these hundred accept the Bevanite policy. But neither do they accept the policy of the leadership, and they are unhappy about the party's official commitment to the full rearmament program. The main thing that this crisis has proved is the growing strength of the Bevanites. In this instance, it is worth noting, the trade union leaders urged moderation on Attlee and Gaitskell. Facing a budget that makes higher living costs and growing unemployment inevitable, the trade unions realize that Labor is in for a bitter battle to defend the working class. Events are steadily pushing both the industrial and

THE GROWTH OF BEVANISM

the political arms of Labor to the Left. How fast and how far they will move it is impossible at this writing to say. But it seems improbable that bi-partisanism can last through the summer. Having escaped expulsion, the Bevanites must now prepare for the annual party conference next fall. It could be a Bevanite triumph.

England should be ashamed that it was not she who led the way to Communism. We let Russia, an industrially backward country, do what we should have done.

—George Bernard Shaw, quoted in the *New Statesman & Nation*,
March 3, 1951

The bourgeois period of history has to create the material basis of the new world—on the one hand universal intercourse founded upon the mutual dependency of mankind, and the means of that intercourse; on the other hand the development of the productive powers of man and the transformation of material production into a scientific domination of natural agencies. Bourgeois industry and commerce create these material conditions of a new world in the same way as geological revolutions have created the surface of the earth. When a great social revolution shall have mastered the results of the bourgeois epoch, the market of the world and the modern powers of production, and subjected them to the common control of the most advanced peoples, then only will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.

—Karl Marx, in the *New York Daily Tribune*, August 8, 1853.

What are called criminals nowadays are not criminals at all. Starvation, and not sin, is the parent of modern crime.

—Oscar Wilde, *The Soul of Man Under Socialism*

SOCIALISM AND THE OVERPOPULATION BOGEY

BY PAUL M. SWEEZY

The recent articles on population by Dr. Grundfest and Professor Fairchild (MR, December 1951, February 1952, March 1952) largely passed over certain questions which I have found to be uppermost in the minds of many students and social scientists. I have no intention to enter into the controversy between Dr. Grundfest and Professor Fairchild, but I think a few comments on these neglected aspects of the population problem may be in order.

First, however, I should like to say a word about the scientific claims of the Malthusian theory. As Professor Fairchild presents Malthus' doctrine, it can't possibly be wrong, but neither can it tell us anything about the real world. A tendency for population to increase at some unspecified geometrical rate is postulated. If in fact it doesn't increase at any such rate (and, historically speaking, it rarely has) the reason must be because certain counter-tendencies (positive and preventive checks, in Malthus' language) have been at work. The actual course of events is thus explained as the result of an interaction between a given tendency and variable counter-tendencies.

This theory can be applied to any actual or conceivable population movement. Variations in birth and death rates—which, apart from emigration and immigration, determine population movements—can always be accounted for in terms of a net strengthening or weakening of the counter-tendencies. Did the population of a certain territory in a certain period, say western Europe from the late Roman Empire to the 9th century, undergo a sharp decline? Malthusian theory can easily explain it: the population had a tendency to *increase*, but the counter-tendencies just happened to produce an extraordinarily low birth rate and an extraordinarily high death rate. Did the population of another territory and another period, say North America in the 19th century, grow by leaps and bounds? That's easy too: it had a tendency to grow that way, and the counter-tendencies happened to be weak.

The trouble with a theory like this, of course, is that it doesn't really explain anything. You might as well forget about the supposed tendency of population to grow in geometrical progression and get right down to the (primarily social) forces which determine birth and death rates. But if you do, you will soon find that there are no universal laws of population, that each social system has its

SOCIALISM AND THE OVERPOPULATION BOGEY

own laws, and that even within a given social system these laws are very far from unchanging. You will also find that you have no more use for Malthus, that his supposedly scientific theory is of no help at all when you tackle the really important problems in the field of population.

So much then for Malthusian theory as it is presented by Professor Fairchild: it is not wrong, it is merely empty of content.

But Malthusian theory as presented by Malthus was considerably more than an empty formula. It was full of statements and implications about social forces operating on population, and for the most part these statements and implications were prejudiced, superficial, and reactionary. This is the aspect of Malthusian theory which Dr. Grundfest criticized, and in my judgment very justifiably criticized.

But when it comes to dealing with the Neo-Malthusians and Malthusiasts of today, it seems to me that Dr. Grundfest weakens his case by not meeting head-on what I take to be their central argument. For example, he strongly criticizes Dr. Gerald Winfield for proposing "that during the next twenty or thirty years not even severe epidemics in China should be attacked with every means available to modern medicine," but he does not deal with the reasoning which led Dr. Winfield to this patently inhumane conclusion. The result is that anyone who has been impressed with Dr. Winfield's argument is likely to be more frustrated than convinced by Dr. Grundfest's criticism. And there *are* many people who have been impressed—not necessarily by Dr. Winfield's specific statement of the case, but by the Neo-Malthusian theory which underlies his thinking.

Briefly, the Neo-Malthusian thesis is that most backward countries already have very large populations relative to their productive resources. These countries have high birth rates, but the rate of increase of their populations is being held down by similarly high death rates. Any reduction in these death rates would bring about a rapid rise in population. Under such circumstances, increasing production would be largely dissipated in maintaining more people rather than in raising living standards of the present impoverished populations. Now, as it happens, the first effect of modernization—using the term to include industrialization, sanitation, development of public health programs, and so on—is generally to reduce the death rate. It seems to follow that, in the absence of effective population control, these backward countries cannot succeed in raising their living standards. Any program of modernization, so the argument goes, is bound to be abortive. As Dr. Winfield expresses it:

All the proposed steps toward industrialization and increased agricultural productivity, all the processes necessary to

enable China to play her logical role in a world community, all plans for her progress are and will be futile unless her population growth can be controlled. Unless her production of consumers can be held to a rate of increase slower than that of her production of goods, a rising standard of living will be impossible and her attempts at rebuilding a failure. (*China: the Land and the People*, 1948, p. 334.)

This kind of reasoning naturally leads to the conclusion that in backward countries all efforts at social reform must be subordinated to, and in fact come after, the successful introduction of birth control. Needless to say, this is a profoundly pessimistic conclusion. It is precisely poverty and lack of education—lack of means and lack of knowledge—that keep backward peoples from practicing birth control now. Those who understand this, and at the same time accept the Neo-Malthusian argument, are likely either to throw up their hands or to put their trust in the kind of barbarous solutions which Dr. Grundfest so rightly denounces.

What is the socialist answer to this central Neo-Malthusian argument?

It is quite true that in some backward countries—though not by any means in all—population growth is one factor which is operating to retard or actually prevent a rise in living standards. As a group of UN experts recently put it:

Estimates of the proportion of the national income which must be saved in order to provide capital for a one percent increase of population vary between two percent and five percent of the national income. Hence, an underdeveloped country in which population is increasing at the not uncommon rate of one and one-half percent per annum, probably needs nearly as much as it is normally likely to save, merely to cope with population growth; under these circumstances, it can do little to raise the average standard of living. (*Measures for the Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries*, UN, May 1951, p. 47.)

But what conclusion should we draw from this? That only birth control can save the day? Let the UN experts answer:

The belief that economic development must inevitably be dissipated in population growth causes pessimism in some quarters. We do not share this view. If vigorous effort is put into developing the underdeveloped countries, we see no reason why their national incomes should not rise at rates higher than the rates at which their populations are currently increasing, or may be expected to increase. The problem is difficult, but it is not insoluble. (P. 45.)

Precisely. The real problem is to raise productivity at the maximum possible rate, to make it outstrip population growth by

SOCIALISM AND THE OVERPOPULATION BOGEY

as wide a margin as the resources of modern science and technology will allow. Not only will this bring about an immediate rise in living standards; it will also bring to the peoples concerned the material means and the knowledge to control their own lives, including the size of their families. Any other approach to the problem is not only reactionary and inhuman: worse than that, it is bound to fail. *Modernization following population control is a Utopian pipe dream; population control following modernization is not only desirable but inevitable.*

But this is not the end of the story; on the contrary, it is only the beginning. The crux of the matter is how to raise productivity "at the maximum possible rate." The answer, as has been argued repeatedly in these pages, is now known beyond any possibility of error or doubt. (See especially "Point Four vs. Social Revolution," June 1950, pp. 34-39, and July 1950, pp. 69-75.) The first step must be social revolution, the throwing off of the incubus of parasitical ruling classes and blood-sucking foreign imperialisms. The second step must be sweeping industrial and agricultural reforms which will release the creative energies of the people and substitute comprehensive planning for the anarchy and waste of the old order. Finally, there must be a huge and sustained national effort, involving all potentially productive elements of society and firmly disciplining those who continue to insist on putting their narrow personal interests above those of the group as a whole.

This, socialists should insist over and over again, is the only way for backward countries to solve their population problems. Socialists should drive home the point that population is not a separate, independent force subject to eternal laws. It is one aspect of a complicated social structure; its laws are derived from those of the social system as a whole. Anyone who is serious about wanting to change those laws must also be serious about wanting to change the social system.

I suggest that if we approach the question of population in this way, and if we boldly tackle the Neo-Malthusians on their own ground, we shall be able to turn the tables on them. From the time of Malthus on, population arguments have bulked large in the intellectual arsenal of reaction; they have been used to show that "the poor are always with us" and that the ideal of social improvement is a snare and a delusion. It is not enough to attack the reactionaries; we must turn their own weapons against them. We can do this in the population case: we can show that overpopulation is far from being an insuperable obstacle to social improvement; the truth is that it is only through social improvement that the bogey of overpopulation can be finally laid low.

JAMAICA—THE WAY FORWARD

BY RICHARD HART

The article on Jamaica by Harvey O'Connor in the January and February issues of MR is well informed, and the analysis is penetrating. But it suffers from a defect similar to that which I observed in the excellent article on Puerto Rico in the February 1951 issue—a failure to appreciate that in a Caribbean colony the road to socialism must traverse a great deal of pre-socialist territory. Mr. O'Connor cheerfully proposes to transform the Island in ten years by turning the wasted labor (the unemployed 30 percent of the adult population) into the “needed capital,” and to convert part of the sugar (export crop) lands to production for the local market. The problem is not so simple.

Our program advocates self-government and the development of industries and food production for the local market at the expense of the markets now reserved for imports. With this, your contributor seems fully in sympathy. But I can only assume, since his usual clarity disappears at this point of the article, that the essence of his criticism of our “Plan of Progress” (the PNP’s election manifesto) is directed at our concern with maintaining a high level of exports and obtaining foreign loans. Possibly he is also critical of our failure to advocate generally the public ownership of new and/or existing industries. (The ungenerous reference to the “King’s Honors” allegedly bestowed on Manley need not be labored. Manley’s “K.C.,” awarded him in 1932, is a professional qualification which even so radical a politician as D. N. Pritt is able to bear without disrepute among his admirers. It is not awarded on the same footing as the King’s Honors List. Also, any barrister can be employed by a litigant who has an appeal before the Privy Council.)

If I am accused of erecting ninepins so as to knock them over, I plead the weakness and uncertainty of Mr. O'Connor’s final passage headed “The Answer” as my excuse.

To answer the last point first, it should be appreciated that the PNP, though nominally a socialist organization, is in fact a national movement in which several strata opposed to imperialist rule partici-

Richard Hart is Vice-President of the Jamaican Trade Union Congress, a member of the Executive Committee of the People’s National Party (PNP), and Secretary of the Caribbean Labor Congress. He was one of those who was interned by the British in a concentration camp, without trial, in 1942.

JAMAICA: THE WAY FORWARD

pate. Its membership includes on the Left the wage earners organized in the Trade Union Congress, in the center the various strata of the middle classes, and on the Right a number of native employers whose annoyance at the economic, cultural, and political restrictions of imperialism is not cancelled by fear of their own workers.

The fact that the PNP's immediate program advocates public ownership of only public utilities is therefore neither surprising nor inappropriate. And the left wing of our party will be forgiven for declining any invitation to strike out independently on a demand for public ownership of the principal means of production if the reward for their patience is that the national movement will thereby be able earlier to reach its anti-imperialist objective.

The necessity for a broad national movement based on the common class interests of those opposed to imperialism is, however, far easier to understand than the apparent acceptance by our movement of the import-export pattern dictated to us over the years by imperialist relationships. The best arable lands are at present given over to the cultivation of sugar cane and bananas for export, and a large variety of consumer goods and foodstuffs which are capable of production locally are imported. Despite criticisms of the pattern forced upon us during 300 years of British rule, the PNP proposes that Jamaica should endeavor to maintain her basic exports.

The necessity for this lies in the fundamental fact that although a limited expansion of agriculture for home consumption is possible, the expansion of industry (including the processing of agricultural products), and not agriculture itself, is our principal remedy for the conditions of poverty so ably described by Mr. O'Connor.

Our only mineral deposit so far discovered in any appreciable quantity is bauxite, and no fuel resources have been located. Our hydro-electric potentialities are very limited. We must therefore calculate on the necessity for importing machinery and possibly fuel for as far into the future as can be envisaged, and for this we will need foreign exchange.

Jamaica is an island of 2.5 million acres. Of this area, 694,710 acres are considered arable, of which 382,750 acres are under cultivation. A certain amount of land not fit for cultivation is being cultivated by small farmers who cannot get access to the good land. Also a substantial part of the 595,000 acres now used as pasture could probably be brought under cultivation if the beef cattle industry were reduced. Nevertheless, agriculture is not capable of absorbing a great deal of manpower. The number of persons engaged in agriculture does not exceed 225,000 of the island's population of

MONTHLY REVIEW

one and one-third million, which is less than the number of persons engaged in agriculture in 1891 when the population was only 640,000. Due to mechanization it is probable that even if the area under cultivation is expanded the number of persons employed will not increase.

There are not less than 160,000 unemployed persons over the age of 15 (the school leaving age is 14 years), and the employment of probably one-third of the remaining 250,000-odd wage earners is seasonal or partial. The movement of population will not be onto the land. Our foreign exchange is derivable from sugar and bananas (now slowly recovering from disease and hurricane), with bauxite as an additional possibility. Only when the supply of fuel and machinery is secured does the possibility of utilizing Jamaica's greatest productive asset, manpower, materialize.

How to obtain stable export markets and secure good export prices is a priority problem, since imperialist connections have secured neither. How to industrialize for the home market in the face of competition from British imports is another. How to manufacture on a sufficiently large scale to be economical despite our small population is a third. It is in the light of these problems that our immediate program must be judged.

Overall, we seek to secure the political independence enabling us to make our own trade arrangements which imperialism now forbids. But the right to bargain will not be tremendously effective on this side of the world without bargaining power. And Jamaica lies too far away from the socialist world to hope for external assistance. The generous assistance of the Soviet Union towards the industrialization of Albania is not an example which capitalist Britain or the United States can be expected to follow. Therefore we must put ourselves in a position in which we have something to give in return for what we ask.

That is why our immediate program, which includes self-government, discriminatory tariffs to help local industry, a central bank to make credit available for industry and agriculture and handle foreign loans, and so on, *also* advocates the establishment of a self-governing federation (on the Australian model) of the present British colonies in the Caribbean area. In this way we believe that we will:

1. Create a population unit (3 million) large enough for our trade to be worth the while of other countries to seek, with whom we may then bargain more effectively for the sale of our basic exports and for loans to purchase machinery;
2. Secure the fuel necessary for industry (Trinidad oil); and
3. Abolish inter-unit customs duties so as to widen the market

of production and industrialization for local consumption.

Whether or not this goal of a self-governing federation is achieved, Jamaica in the meantime presses on with its demand for immediate local self-government, distrusting the machinations of the British government and suspecting that the discussions on federation may be used to delay the realization of our aspirations. We have had the experience of how effectively they have used Bustamante since their deal with him in 1942 (not 1945) to divide and continue to rule.

In closing, I would like to make two points clear. The first concerns the form in which foreign exchange should be obtained to purchase machinery when the proceeds of ordinary trading are insufficient. I profoundly disagree with those who like Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico, seek to industrialize by encouraging the *direct* investment of foreign capital. In my view, this is a dangerous course which can only strengthen imperialism. I believe that the only safe course is the raising of loans through a government agency such as a central bank. This might be called *indirect* investment.

The second point is that although the achievement of self-government may involve acceptance of a program not including the public ownership of the means of production, nevertheless only socialism can fully solve the problems of all nations in general and small underdeveloped countries in particular. The propagation of the principles of socialism is therefore a matter which should never be neglected, however little bearing it may have on our immediate program.

Postscript. Since my communication was sent to you, I regret that the very split that the left wing of the PNP has done so much to avoid has taken place. Hitherto, Manley has pursued a center course and has with much skill resolved the occasional friction developing between Left and Right. But with the growth of the Trade Union Congress, which has been winning over the workers who were formerly kept out of the national movement by the pro-imperialist Bustamante, a change in the relative strength of the right and left wings has been taking place in favor of the latter. At the beginning of this year, a right-wing revolt commenced and grew until it took the form of an ultimatum to Manley that the right leadership would quit and red-smear the party if the left wing were not thrown out. With this political pistol at his head, Manley made his choice. He moved completely to the Right. A "tribunal" decided that the left leadership must either resign from the party or be expelled. The struggle is now in progress with Manley's hat (a threat to resign) in

MONTHLY REVIEW

the ring. The smear of "Communism" is, of course, being employed to the full. On March 29-30, a special party conference will decide the issue. What will become of our "Program for Progress" depends on what becomes of the PNP itself, and about that it is still too early to predict.

The profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization lies unveiled before our eyes, turning from its home, where it assumes respectable forms, to the colonies, where it goes naked.

—Karl Marx, in the *New York Daily Tribune*, August 8, 1853.

Governments created by the people have always been more honest and less corrupt than those originating with the aristocracy, and revolutions made by the people have generally been more merciful and less bloody than the victories of the upper classes. No student of European history can fail to see this.

—Wendell Phillips

Militarism is the characteristic, not of an army, but of a society. Its essence is not any particular quality or scale of military preparation, but a state of mind, which, in its concentration on one particular element in social life, ends finally by exalting it until it becomes the arbiter of all the rest. The purpose for which military forces exist is forgotten. They are thought to stand by their own right and to need no justification. Instead of being regarded as an instrument which is necessary in an imperfect world, they are elevated into an object of superstitious veneration, as though the world would be a poor, insipid place without them, so that political institutions and social arrangements and intellect and morality and religion are crushed into a mold made to fit one activity, which in a sane society is a subordinate activity, like the police, or the maintenance of prisons, or the cleansing of sewers, but which in a militarist state is a kind of mystical epitome of society itself.

—R. H. Tawney, *The Acquisitive Society*

"FOR THE LIBERATION OF MANKIND"

When social behavior is not cooperative it is diseased behavior. The principle which controls all biologically healthy behavior is love. Love, social behavior, cooperation and security mean very much the same thing. Without love there can be no healthy social behavior, cooperation, or security. What men want is to feel related to something, whether to family, friends, or deity. Man does not want independence in the sense of functioning separately from the interests of his fellows. That kind of independence leads to loneliness and fear. What man wants is the positive freedom that follows the pattern of his life as an infant within the family—dependent security, the feeling that he is part of a group, accepted, wanted, loved and loving.

In human beings who develop normally, this feeling of love and unity with the group continues to grow all through life. It is a common observation that the happiest persons are those who most strongly feel a sense of connection with the whole community. They are happiest because they are giving fullest play to their innermost tendencies.

Men who do not love one another are sick—sick not from any disease arising within themselves, but from a disease which has been enculturated within them by the false values of their societies. Belief in false values, in competition instead of cooperation, in class and race and national prejudice instead of cooperation, in narrow selfish interests instead of altruism, in atomism (especially atombombism) instead of universalism, in the value of money instead of the value of man, represents man turning upon all that is innately good in him.

—Ashley Montagu, *Statement On Race*, 1951

If my soldiers began to think, not one of them would remain in the ranks.

—Frederick the Great

Man's dearest possession is life and it is given to him to live but once. He must live so as to feel no torturing regrets for years without purpose; so live as not to be seared by the shame of a cowardly and trivial past; so live that dying he can say "all my life and all my strength were given to the finest cause in all the world—the fight for the liberation of mankind."

—Nicholas Ostrovsky, *How the Steel Was Tempered*

THE AMERICAN RESISTANCE: A COMMUNICATION

BY SCOTT NEARING

You began the November 1951 issue of *Monthly Review* with a statement captioned "Toward an American Resistance Movement." When this article appeared, I was on a speaking trip which covered more than 15,000 miles and took me to small towns and big cities all over North America. On most of the trip I was talking about war and peace, because at the moment I believe that war is the most terrible enemy confronting mankind.

I read your article in California. It pointed up what I had been observing: the rise of the American Resistance.

You can find members of the American Resistance in every community—small as well as large. Some of them tend sheep and cattle, run individual farms, or operate gas stations at a crossroads. Some of them are field hands, wage workers, professionals. Locally they usually know about each other. By states, and nationally, they are as yet unorganized. They have adopted no program or platform. They have one thing in common: they are convinced that the United States, in its domestic and foreign policies, is headed in the wrong direction. They believe that those now in authority, consciously or unconsciously, are moving toward the consolidation of wealth and power in the hands of a small, self-perpetuating oligarchy which is aiming at world domination through war. Members of the Resistance oppose these policies. They believe that in a technically advanced society, war benefits only a tiny minority, and that community interests are best served by peace and cooperation.

Resistance members are under constant attack. They lose their jobs, are ostracized, blacklisted, harassed, indicted, jailed. Some have been murdered. They have been through the wringer and know that any of these things may happen any time to them and their fellow-resisters. They look upon persecution as an occupational hazard. They have joined the Resistance voluntarily. They take the bitter with the sweet.

Scott Nearing, well-known author and lecturer, writes an excellent quarterly report called World Events (address: East Palatka, Florida—subscription price: \$1 a year).

THE AMERICAN RESISTANCE

Several times in the past a Resistance has sprung from the soil of North America. Between 1750 and 1787, it demanded independence of the British Monarchy. From 1840 to 1860, it demanded freedom for slaves and unity for the United States. Today it demands peace and plenty for North America and for mankind.

Under existing conditions in the United States, it is not prudent to go into details. I am writing this letter only to corroborate your editorial observations and to say to you and your readers that the forces of the Resistance are gathering, and when they meet, you will be astonished at the greatness of their numbers, proud of their courage, and filled with admiration at their determination and their ability to stand up under pressure.

It is our fortune to have been born at one of those moments in history which demand from each one of us as an individual that he make his private decision. Hamlet could bemoan his fate in being born at such a juncture, and we also could wish for a more peaceful time, but we no more than Hamlet can escape from making our decision.

—Ralph Fox, *The Novel and the People*, 1945

*They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink,
From the truth they needs must think;
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.*

—From "Freedom" by James Russell Lowell

This animal is wicked. When attacked, he defends himself.

—Old French proverb

I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in as many as half a dozen cases: The loud little handful will shout for war. The pulpit will warily and cautiously protest at first. . . . The great mass of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes, and will try to and will say, earnestly and indignantly: "it is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no need for war."

Then the few will shout even louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first, will get a hearing and will be applauded: but, it will not last long. The few who want war will outshout those who want peace; and presently, the anti-war audiences will thin out and peace will become unpopular.

Before long, you will see a curious thing; anti-war speakers will be stoned from the platforms, and free speech will be strangled by hordes of furious men who still agree with the speakers, but, dare not admit it. . . . The whole nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry and shout itself hoarse, and will mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth for peace; then such mouths will cease to open.

Next, the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame on the nation that is to be attacked; and each man will be glad of these lies and will study them, because they soothe his conscience; and thus he will, by and by, convince himself that the war is just, and he will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys by this self-deception.

—Mark Twain

There is not any instance recorded either in sacred or profane history, in which the oppressors and enslavers of mankind, except in individual cases, have been induced, by mere moral suasion, to surrender their despotic power, and let the oppressed go free; but in nearly every instance, from the time that Pharaoh and his hosts were drowned in the Red Sea, down to the present day, they have persisted in their evil course until sudden destruction came upon them, or they were compelled to surrender their ill-gotten power in some other manner.

—William Lloyd Garrison, 1840

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Page</i>
Austin, Aleine,	<i>"Force and Violence" on the Labor Front</i>	5	155
Baran, Paul A.,	<i>Economic Development of Backward Areas</i>	4	128
British Socialist, A,	<i>The Growth of Bevanism</i>	12	384
	<i>The Labor Party's Next Task</i>	8	243
Canadian Socialist, A,	<i>Commonsense in Canada</i>	9	277
Davis, Arthur K.,	<i>Behind the Civil Rights Crisis</i>	5	138
	<i>Freedom Under Socialism:</i>		
	<i>Summary and Comment</i>	1	18
Davidson, Basil,	<i>Awakening in Africa</i>	11	343
Editors, The,	<i>Memo to Graduate Students</i>	6	181
	<i>Reply to Mr. Bittelman</i>	7	212
Engels, Friedrich,	<i>Freedom and Necessity</i>	1	31
Fairchild, Henry Pratt,	<i>In Defense of Malthus</i>	10	315
Flamm, Irving H.,	<i>The Road to Socialism in America</i>	9	285
<i>Free World Department</i>		5	163
		10	322
Goshal, Kumar,	<i>The Indian Elections and American Policy</i>	12	364
Grundfest, Harry,	<i>Malthusiasm</i>	8	247
	<i>Reply to Professor Fairchild</i>	11	351
Hart, Richard,	<i>Jamaica: The Way Forward</i>	12	394
Huberman, Leo,	<i>Miss Coleman Had a Point</i>	4	121
Kosambi, D. D.,	<i>Imperialism and Peace</i>	2	45
Lamont, Corliss,	<i>On "Soviet Aggression"</i>	11	335
Lynd, Staughton,	<i>Notes on the Chinese Revolution</i>	10	302
Moszkowska, Natalie,	<i>Reformism and Internationalism</i>	8	256
Nearing, Scott,	<i>The American Resistance:</i>		
	<i>A Communication</i>	12	400
O'Connor, Harvey,	<i>CIO at a Dead End</i>	8	239
	<i>Jamaica: The Colonial Dilemma</i>		
	<i>Part I</i>	9	268
	<i>Part II</i>	10	307
	<i>Venezuela: A Study in Imperialism</i>	3	78

MONTHLY REVIEW

Author	Title	No.	Page
<i>Review of the Month</i>	<i>Candidates and Issues</i>	12	357
	<i>Capitalism and American Foreign Policy</i>	11	328
	<i>Capitalist Freedom</i>	3	65
	<i>Conflict in the Ruling Class</i>	10	294
	<i>Crisis in the Middle East and North Africa</i>	8	235
	<i>Cry Halt!</i>	6	165
	<i>Footnote to Korea</i>	6	171
	<i>German Unification Again</i>	8	237
	<i>Iran: The Crisis in Microcosm</i>	3	67
	<i>Korea—One Year Later</i>	4	101
	<i>Needed: Courage and Patriotism</i>	11	325
	<i>Plumbing the Depths</i>	5	136
	<i>Political Rights Are for Using</i>	8	238
	<i>Private Interest vs. Public Welfare</i>	5	137
	<i>Same Work—Different Unions</i>	8	229
	<i>Socialism Is the Only Answer</i>	1	1
	<i>Stop, Look, and Listen!</i>	9	261
	<i>The British Election</i>	8	237
	<i>The Economic Situation and the Fight for Peace</i>	5	133
	<i>The Eighty-Second Congress</i>	8	236
	<i>The Korean Truce Talks</i>	8	234
	<i>The Meaning of MacArthur</i>	2	33
	<i>Toward an American Resistance Movement</i>	7	197
	<i>Why Americans Will Be Socialists</i>	10	293
Robinson, Joan,	<i>Preparation for War</i>	6	194
Shoaf, George H.,	<i>The Biggest Little Paper This Country Ever Knew</i>	3	88
Special Correspondent, A,	<i>The Welfare State—For Capitalists Too</i>	6	184
Stone, I. F.,	<i>The Implications of Redbaiting</i>	5	160
Student of Race Relations, A,	<i>Uncle Tom In Striped Pants</i>	12	377
Student of the USSR, A,	<i>The Economic Superiority of Socialist Planning</i>	5	148
Sweezy, Paul M.,	<i>Certain Aspects of American Capitalism</i>	7	229
	<i>Socialism and the Overpopulation Bogey</i>	12	390
	<i>The American Ruling Class</i>		
	Part I	1	10
	Part II	2	58
Wasserman, Ursula,	<i>Socialism Via Kibbutzim?</i>	7	205
Webster, James,	<i>A New Road for Student Socialism</i>	6	175
Zilliacus, Konni,	<i>The Crisis in the Labor Party</i>	2	50

(continued from inside front cover)

\$5. Those who want to take advantage of the pre-publication offer therefore have no time to lose. Orders will be filled as soon as the book comes off the press, which of course will be some time prior to the official publication date.

Please note that this month's issue is the last of Volume 3 and that a large number of subscriptions are running out. If the code number under your name on the envelope in which this copy reached you is 3-12 or Apr-52, yours is one of them. May we ask you to save everybody time and trouble by renewing at once? We are enclosing a renewal slip for your convenience. Remember that if you take advantage of the combination subscription and Stone book offer (\$5 for both), you will receive the book at the earliest possible moment.

Meanwhile, we are very glad to be able to report that the advance sale of *The Hidden History of the Korean War* continues to be excellent. People are obviously hungry for really reliable information. The book can be sold, and if it is sold in sufficient quantity it can become an important political force. A word to the wise is sufficient.

Monthly Review Associates asks us to publish the following report on the extremely successful Struik meeting held in New York on March 18th: More than 600 people came to the meeting. Angus Cameron was chairman, and the speakers included, in addition to Professor Struik, the editors of MR and I. F. Stone. In the past, MRA has never taken up a collection at its meetings but decided this time to make an exception in favor of the Struik Defense Committee which is raising money to meet the legal expenses of the case. More than \$1300 was collected, a most gratifying result. MRA extends its thanks to all who helped to make the Struik meeting a memorable occasion.

Up to now, we have tried to answer personally all letters to the editors except those of a purely routine or business nature obviously not calling for an answer. But recently, our mail seems to have been growing and the press of business, especially connected with the publication of *The Hidden History of the Korean War*, has certainly been growing. Sometimes, therefore, our performance may fall behind our intentions. If you write us and don't get an answer, please forgive us. Or if you can't forgive us, swear at us. But in any case don't let our failure to answer keep you from writing again when you have something to say. We study the mail carefully and find it extraordinarily helpful in planning and editing the magazine. The closer we can keep in touch with our subscribers and readers, the better MR will be.

A typographical error of sufficient importance to warrant correction crept into last month's Review of the Month. On p. 327, lines 22 and 23, the following sentence appeared: "After all, Americans are out in the open and under the careful scrutiny of the whole world." This should have read: "After all, 'his' Americans are out in the open and under the careful scrutiny of the whole world."

All MR readers in the San Francisco Bay Area are invited to meet on Sunday, April 27, at 3 p.m. at the house of Clarence D. Herriott, 2635 Webster Street, Berkeley (one block south of Ashby Avenue and one-half block west of College Avenue). The purpose of the meeting is to get acquainted and to take steps to form a Monthly Review Associates group.

Announcement

The editors of MONTHLY REVIEW are eager to secure as wide distribution as possible for

I. F. Stone's

THE HIDDEN HISTORY OF THE KOREAN WAR

The price of \$5, while not high today for non-fiction books of this length, is, we recognize, very steep for many of our readers. Though that price is dictated by the cost of production, we can, with your help, cut it considerably.

We make the following offers:

1. Pre-publication price of \$3

The book is now scheduled to appear in April. Send in \$3 in advance of publication and we will send you the book, postpaid, as soon as it is off the press.

2. Combination subscription-book price of \$5

A new sub, or a renewal to MR, costs \$3 per year. Send in \$5 and we will give you a year's subscription and send the book, postpaid, as soon as it comes off the press.

SUGGESTED ORDER FORM

MONTHLY REVIEW, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose:

- ☐ \$3 the pre-publication price of Stone's book.
- ☐ \$5 for one-year sub and Stone's book.
 - ☐ New
 - ☐ Renewal

